



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,005	06/25/2001	Michael Shawn Giffin	SNY-P4260	9424
24337	7590	01/31/2006		
MILLER PATENT SERVICES 2500 DOCKERY LANE RALEIGH, NC 27606			EXAMINER NGUYEN, QUANG N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/891,005

Applicant(s)

GIFFIN ET AL.

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 29 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

***Detailed Action***

1. This Office Action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed on 12/14/2005. Applicant's arguments, see the Appeal Brief, filed 12/14/2005, with respect to claims 1-20, 29 and 30 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The final rejection of claims 1-20, 29 and 30 has been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-2, 9-10 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads (US 6,311,214), in view of Nesamoney et al. (US 6,044,374), hereinafter "Nesamoney".**

4. As to claim 1, Rhoads teaches a method, comprising:

storing a music file representing a musical selection for a first user (*at a predetermined location, a personal music library maintained by a user can be stored at a remote web site*) (Rhoads, C46: L28-45);

mapping the first user to the music file (the personal music library maintained by the user can be stored at a remote web site protected with a user-set password and can be downloaded whenever it is convenient) (Rhoads, C46: L28-45);

receiving a request from any of the mapped users for playback of the music file *(in response to the requests for playback, the music library can be downloaded whenever it is convenient)* (Rhoads, C46: L28-34); and

transmitting the music file to the user that sent the request for playback using wireless transmission, as a streaming music file *(the personal music library can be equipped with wireless capabilities adapted to provide music to the user's playback devices such as MP3 player by short-range wireless broadcast)* (Rhoads, C46: L35-53).

However, Rhoads does not explicitly teach mapping other users who wish to store the musical selection to the music file.

In a related art, Nesamoney teaches a method and system for accessing and sharing metadata *(i.e., the music file)* among a number of data marts *(i.e., among a number of users)* through the use of object referencing in a client/server environment, wherein one or more repositories residing within the mass storage device are created by either a client or a server *(i.e., the music files are created/stored by a user)*. Nesamoney teaches by using multiple references *(i.e., by mapping to other users who wish to store/access the musical selection to the music file)*, the same object, i.e., the same music file can be accessed, used, and shared by multiple users (Nesamoney, Summary of the Invention).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Rhoads and Nesamoney to include mapping other users who wish to store the musical selection to the music file since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to eliminate having redundant duplication and also to allow objects (*i.e., the music files*) to be shared and reused by any number of users.

5. As to claim 2, Rhoads-Nesamoney teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving from the first user a request to store the music file; and wherein the storing is carried out as a response to the request (*receiving a user request to store the music file at the predetermined location*) (Rhoads, C46: L24-34).

6. Claims 9-10 are corresponding storage medium claims of method claims 1-2; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 15-16 are corresponding data center claims of method claims 1-2; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 3-8, 11-14 17-20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads-Nesamoney, in view of Kurihara et al. (US 2002/0023101 A1), hereinafter "Kurihara".

9. As to claims 4-5, Rhoads-Nesamoney teaches the method of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach charging each of the users mapped to the music file a fee for storage of the music file and for transmitting the music file to the user that sent the requests for playback.

In a related art, Kurihara teaches a content managing system and method, wherein each user pays the fee for the user area 18 of the customer file storage 13 so each user can store the file of a new content to the user area 18, delete the file of a content from the user area 18, move the file of a content stored in the user area 18, and download the file of a content stored in the user area 18 to the user terminal unit 2 (Kurihara, paragraph [0044]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Rhoads-Nesamoney and Kurihara to have the user paying the fee for storage and transmission of the music file since such methods were conventionally employed in the art for the system to provide users with storage area in the range of the contracted capacity to add (upload), delete, move and access (download) content (music file) stored in the assigned user area.

10. As to claim 6, Rhoads-Nesamoney-Kurihara teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising uploading the music file from the first user prior to the storing (*the user can store the file of his or her content to the user area 18*) (Kurihara, paragraph [0044]).

11. As to claims 3 and 7-8, Rhoads-Nesamoney-Kurihara teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising obtaining the music file from a commercial music source prior to the storing and paying a royalty for use of the music file (*each user can purchase the file of content stored in the content library 11 and store the file of the purchased content to the user area 18 of the customer file storage 13*) (Kurihara, paragraphs [0046] and [0057]).

12. Claims 11-14 are corresponding storage medium claims of method claims 4-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claims 17-20 are corresponding data center claims of method claims 4-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

14. Claim 29 is a corresponding combination method claim of method claims 1-5 and 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

15. Claim 30 is a corresponding combination data center claim of method claims 1-7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

16. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 12/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
PATENT EXAMINER